UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	IG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/532,660	10/532,660 01/27/2006		Pramod K. Srivastava	8449-323-999	. 6470	
20583 JONES DA	7590 V	07/11/2007	•	EXA	EXAMINER	
222 EAST 41ST ST				AEDER	AEDER, SEAN E	
NEW YORI	K, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			,	1642		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
,				07/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,660	SRIVASTAVA, PRAMOD K.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean E. Aeder	1642	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ag 2a) □ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or e Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed to the control of the co	election requirement. c. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-18 and 37-44, drawn to treatment devices.

Group II, claim(s) 19-36, drawn to a method of treating a cancer comprising administering lysed tissue.

The inventions listed as groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking groups I-II appears to be that they all relate to the special technical feature of a treatment device comprising an extraction mechanism configured to extract a tissue sample, a lysis mechanism coupled to the extraction mechanism, wherein said lysis mechanism is configured to induce cell lysis of said tissue sample to produce a lysed tissue sample, and an administration mechanism coupled to both said extraction mechanism and said lysis mechanism, wherein said administration mechanism is configured to administer said lysed tissue sample.

However, Siegel (US Patent 6,495,347; filed July 7 2000) teaches a treatment device comprising an extraction mechanism configured to extract a tissue sample, a lysis mechanism coupled to the extraction mechanism, wherein said lysis mechanism is configured to induce cell lysis of said tissue sample to produce a lysed tissue sample, and an administration mechanism coupled to both said extraction mechanism and said lysis mechanism, wherein said administration mechanism is configured to administer said lysed tissue sample (see line 60 of column 26 to line 7 of column 27, in particular).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of groups I-II does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, groups I-II are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Art Unit: 1642

Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Claims 1-18 and 37-44 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of "**lysis mechanisms**" comprising the following: a pair of rotatable cylinders; a pair of intermeshing rotatable gears; a grate; rotatable blades; a cooling mechanism;....an ultrasonic mechanism (see claim 10, in particular) The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Claims 1-44 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of "tissue samples" comprising the following: a tumor sample; a tumor sample that has been lysed and mixed with a fluid and homogenized; an infected sample;...an infected sample of an animal other than a human that has been lysed and mixed with a fluid and homogenized (see claim 16, in particular). The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Claims 19- 36 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of "methods of lysing" comprising the following: blending; grating; crushing; thermal treating; sonication (see claim 23, in particular). The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in, method steps, reagents and/or dosages and/or schedules used, response variables, and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be

Art Unit: 1642

restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Claims 26-28, 32, and 41-44 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of "additive solutions/biologically active additives" comprising the following: a cytokine; an adjuvant; an antibody; an anticancer agent;...an anti-infective agent (see claims 27, 28, and 42). The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean E. Aeder, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-8787. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shanon Foley can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).